DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 933 JC 890 293

AUTHOR Forman, Marshall
TITLE The Faculty That Stays Together Grays Together: The Faculty Development Movement.
INSTITUTION Princeton Univ., NJ. Mid-Career Fellowship Program.
PUB DATE May 89
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Community Colleges; Educational History; Emotional Development; *Faculty Development; *Instructional Improvement; State Programs; Teacher Burnout; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Retirement; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The origins of the faculty development movement in higher education can be traced to the mid-1970's, when low retirement rates were virtually eliminating career mobility for professors, and changes in student demographics, educational settings, and instructional methods required many faculty members to alter their usual teaching practices. Private foundations and the Federal Government began funding organized faculty development programs emphasizing instructional development and teaching improvement. In the early 1980's, reduced clerical support, reduced travel budgets, massive amounts of deferred maintenance, as well as a decrease of about 13% in faculty earning power, triggered the formulation of a new faculty development paradigm. This paradigm draws upon social-psychological theories of adult socialization to provide more holistic development activities. The New Jersey Department of Higher Education, for example, has proposed a statewide initiative to strengthen college faculty through far-reaching efforts, including an Institute for Collegiate Teaching and Learning located on a state college campus. A case study of faculty development activities at Brookdale Community College (New Jersey) revealed four basic levels of activities: (1) formally organized activities, including a Faculty Development Committee and 21 sub-committees; (2) a Center for Educational Research; (3) contractual arrangements, such as the sabbatical; and (4) informal activities, such as workshops and seminars. The best approach to faculty development programs appears to be a multifaceted, flexible one balancing individual and corporate activity. Teaching improvement programs should be handled with sensitivity, and faculty must feel the program to be their own, and not imposed upon them by an administration or outside agency. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307933

THE FACULTY THAT STAYS TOGETHER GRAYS TOGETHER:

THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT MOVEMENT

JC 890 293

May 1989

Marshall Forman
Assistant Professor
of Sociology
Brookdale Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Buhn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Faculty that Stays Together Grays Together: The Faculty Development Movement

Marshall A. Forman
Assistant Professor, Sociology
Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, NJ
1988-1989 Mid-Career Fellow, Princeton University

Faculty Development as a Social Movement:
Background and Evolution

Concern for human resources within higher educational environments is a relatively recent phenomenon. It is only within the last quarter century that we begin to see colleges and universities formally recognizing "faculty development" as a major responsibility.

In the past, as Light(1984) has suggested, academics were thought of as professionals and scholars in their respective disciplinary areas, while the teaching process received virtually no attention. Institutional practises in support of their faculty were almost exclusively in support of research or scholarly activities. The sabbatical leave, begun at Harvard in 1810, is the oldest form of faculty support and emerged as the "paradigm" for faculty support over the next century and a half(Blackburn, et. al., 1980). As this research model became the standard approach at major universities, it soon affected faculty practices at most colleges. " In general, sabbaticals were competitive and given for research projects that could not be pursued on the professor's home campus and that required both travel and free time(Eble and McKeachie, 1985, p.6)". In their origins, therefore, sabbaticals were neither designed to improve pedagogical skills nor to enhance the intrinsic work satisfaction of individual faculty members.

By the early 1970's, emergent demographic and economic trends altered the culture and social structure of institutions of higher education in ways which provoked growing numbers of college faculty and administrators to organize in an attempt to influence the social and psychological conditions of academic work; in short, we witness the origins of contemporary faculty development. Following the expansive period of the 1960's, many colleges and universities began to face declining enrollments, changing enrollment patterns, increased requirements for "accountability," and declining financial resources(Eble and McKeachie, 1985: pp.3-4). An "innovative" university created in the 1960's, for example, calculated that over 60% of its faculty were not scheduled to retire until after the year 2000. Elsewhere, reported Gaff(1976: pp.1-2), a long established university has become "tenured in" with more than 90% of its faculty holding tenure. Demographic projections began to indicate that as we move toward the year 2000, college age populations throughout the U.S. will provide very few openings with tenure possibilities. By the mid 1970's, low retirement rates and "steady state" conditions in higher education were virtually eliminating career mobility for professors. Thus, according to many educational analysts(Gaff, 1976; Blackburn and Baldwin, 1983; Cohen and Brawer, 1977), the future of so many academic faculty became tied much more intimately than in the

past to conditions within their present educational institution; a surplus of faculty at the "wrong age" was created, i.e., mid-career and far from retirement.

Furthermore, changes in clientele, educational settings and instructional methods required many faculty members to alter their usual teaching practices. New student categories such as ethnic minorities, first generation students, adult learners, and returning women imposed new demands on the teaching/learning process. In 1969, Nevitt Sanford and some associates at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkely, California interviewed random samples of faculty members at various colleges in the San Francisco area. Most faculty in the study sample expressed a sense of vulnerability and threat apparently deriving from the above changes in the milieu of higher education. Faculty members "...had little sense of their impact upon students, beyond some formal knowledge of how much content students learn and the informal opinions of the vocal students. Even in those cases where they perceive that they are not teaching well, they probably do not know how to be more effective. And most faculty members have only the vaguest idea of the organizational workings or the social psychology of their institution(Freedman, 1979: pp.2-4)." Sanford's seminal research(1971) in addition to Change Magazine's

publication of "Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment" were perhaps to the faculty development movement what Betty Friedan's "Feminine Mystique" and Michael Harrington's "The Other America" were to the women's movement and the war on poverty, respectively.Faculty development, although not a new term, assumed a new sense of importance during the 1970's and gained further currency as a result of the above publications. Educators recognized that "...faculty members will remain at one institution for a longer period of time, they will look to that institution to provide the opportunities and support for their own professional and personal growth, and current faculty will have a key role in maintaining institutional vitality(Gaff, 1976: p.14)." Campus administrators, leaders of educational associations, statewide planners, and foundation officials began to facilitate the growth and development of faculty.

Throughout the 1970's into the current decade, organized faculty development programs were largely supported by funding from external sources. Private foundations such as the Danforth Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the Mellon Foundation funded programs at many colleges. Both the Carnegie and Ford Foundations have also assisted faculty development programs. In addition, the federal government, through its Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, began to finance faculty development

programs(Eble and McKeachie, 1985; Gaff, 1976; Baldwin, 1981). This paper shall not provide an exhaustive listing of specific faculty development programs emerging at colleges and universities during this formative period of the movement. The aim is rather to delineate the belief system which appears to underly the manifold organizational manifestations of faculty development during different phases of its evolution. Thomas Kuhn's(1970) notion of "paradigmatic shifts" in scientific communities is a useful conceptual tool for investigating the "definitions of reality" which have shaped faculty development in the contemporary U.S.

Kuhn's(1970) "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" is one of the most influential scholarly works in recent decades. Scientific research, according to Kuhn, is based upon certain assumptions about the fundamental nature of the phenomena under investigation. The prevailing, traditional "paradigms" of "normal science" structure the research process until accumulating anomalies create crises leading to paradigm shifts(scientific revolutions). The newly emerging paradigms, e.g., Einstein's theory of relatively, are different conceptions of reality in comparison to previous tradition. Kuhn's description of scientific communities can be used heuristically in the study of communities and movements organized for purposes other than doing scientific research. His approach for example, has been applied in such diverse fields as art

history, religion, political science, and foreign policy (Hollinger, 1973; Kuklick,1979).

The emphasis upon instructional development and teaching improvement broadly characterizes the conceptual paradigm driving faculty development programs throughout the 1970's into the current decade(Freedman, 1979). Most faculty development centers emerging during this period "... are concerned with instructional development. The focus of their activities is the curriculum, or the class, not the faculty member. These centers are concerned with behavioral objectives, the design of learning experiences, and more efficient use of instructional devices and aids and orderly evaluation(Freedman, 1979: p.viii)." Furthermore, according to Freedman(1979), while there were some programs concerned with the attitudes and feelings of faculty, most of those programs had a limited intellectual basis. More specifically: "Their activities are not informed by theories of personal development or by theories of organizational change. They draw but little or not at all from psychological or social psychological theory(Freedman,1979: p.ix)"

The impetus for this emphasis upon instructional development, argue Eble and McKeachie(1985: p. 9ff), emerged from the size and the criticism from the undergraduate student body in the 1960's. From 1969 to 1971, the Association of American Colleges(AAC) received Carnegie Foundation funding to conduct a two year "Project to Improve College Teaching." The

most salient and influential aspect of that work consisted of the recommendation that student evaluations become part of a more systematic "career development" approach to college teachers. The AAC Project suggested that by identifying and evaluating teaching skills, ways might be found to assist faculty in acquiring further teaching competence.

As faculty development became an identifiable, formalized activity on more and more campuses, it took on a familiar "professional identity." Specifically, networking organizations emerged, articles and books proliferated, and "faculty development" centers were created at a growing number of educational institutions.

Gaff(1976: pp.187-228)presents an extensive listing of colleges and universites(2 and 4 year)which, as of mid-1975, were operating instructional improvement programs. Virtually all of the 200 centers and programs listed, according to Gaff, emphasized "...the in-service education of college teachers and the improvement of their instruction." The names of most of the programs on this list are variations on the theme of "instructional development," e.g, Staff and Instructional Development Program, Center for Teaching and Learning, and Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation are typical of Gaff's list. In the 1975-1976 academic year(generally considered to be the high point of this "first wave" of

the faculty development movement), a survey by Centra(1978) identified some faculty development practices--typically focusing upon instructional improvement--at more than 60% of the study sample. In addition, the same survey identified over 40% of the sample as having a person and/or office engaged in such activities.

Because community college faculty have typically not emphasized research and traditional scholarly activities, the need for instructional development programs was not originally as pronounced as at the four year institutions((Cohen and Brawer, 1977: pp.66-73). Nevertheless, by the early 1970's, community colleges were also faced with changing conditions--particularly the reduction in growth of new full time faculty members--which led them, too, toward the development of faculty development programs. Throughout the 70's, community college "faculty renewal" programs" "...suffered from identification with in-service training, a catch-all term for activities conducted by the college that were presumed to have an effect on an instructor's professional functioning(Cohen and Brawer, 1977: p.69)." A 1970 American Association of Junior Colleges survey disclosed that most "faculty development" programs consisted of workshops and short course in-service programs focusing around education, curriculum development, and learning theories(O' Banion, 1972). Thus, the "teaching imperative" represents the dominant paradigm of the faculty development

movement during its emergence in the 1970's. Eventually, according to the Kuhnian hypothesis, activities within the limits of a paradigm reach a "dead end," when significant problems arise that cannot be adequately addressed without going outside the paradigm. A period of crises occurs during which time a new paradigm emerges; in the physical sciences, the new paradigm(a scientific revolution, according to Kuhn) generally discredits and replaces the previous model of inquiry. However, in social movements a newly emergent paradigm may co-exist with and/or incorporate the previous "definition of reality."

The "crisis events" which triggered the formulation of a new faculty development paradigm in the early 1980's consist of the intensification of all of those conditions which provoked the first wave of faculty development activities in the 1970's. The most often cited deteriorating conditions of academic life include: reduced clerical support,reduced travel budgets, and massive amounts of deferred maintainance(Schuster, 1989). Furthermore, faculty members lost about 13%of their earning power(as measured in constant 1985-1986 dollars) from 1972 to 1986(Stern, 1988). Seemingly relentless marketplace forces, e.g., the oversupply of faculty and the emphasis upon student consumerism, and the escalating demands for accountability and assessment have undermined the faculty's ability to control its agenda and destiny(Schuster,1986).

During the 1980's, the survey literature in educational research began to identify the widespread existence of "academic burnout" as the human resource consequence of the ongoing deterioration of the conditions of the academic workplace.

According to survey data(Gmelch, 1983; Clark, et.al., 1986; Mancillas, 1988),academic burnout is experienced across all disciplines and at small, large, private and public, two and four year institutions." Burnout is generally described as a feeling of exhaustion and ineffectiveness resulting from depleted mental and physical resources. In short "burnout" (a social-psycholgical manifestation certainly not limited to the teaching profession)is a feeling of being professionally "stuck" with little control over one's environment(Melendez and Guzman, 1983).

Compounding the problem for community college teachers are the heavier teaching loads, the relative lack of opportunities to offer specialized courses in their areas of interest, and the lack of time(in comparison to the four year college environment)to work closely with individual students and follow their development over a period of time. "There is the danger that teaching becomes a 40 hour a week job in which one simply meets classes, corrects papers, and makes teaching and learning as dull as dish washing(Eble and McKeachie, 1985: p. 220)." It is in response to the above conditions that

the faculty development movement takes a new direction in the 1980's, a direction which broadens in scope and begins to emphasize the personal dimension of faculty life.

The emergent faculty development paradigm of the 1980's begins to draw upon social-psycholgical theories of adult socialization, an approach which links professional development with "stage-of-the-life-cycle" events. From this perspective, academic burnout is placed in the broader context of "mid-life crisis," a stage in which one's youthful, idealistic expectations collide with one's actual achievements. This more expansive conceptual model(vis-a-vis the "teaching imperative" model of the 1970's)maintains that the traditional emphasis upon sabbatical leaves, research stipends, and improvement of instruction programs are inadequate to meet the need for the personal dimension of adult development. In this context, we see more "holistic" developmental activities begin to emerge on college campuses throughout the country.

Some examples illustrating the more holistic dimensions of developmental activity include: faculty career consulting, an activity in which a consultant assists faculty in determining career directions,clarifying issues,and locating resources; wellness programs which promote good health and physical fitness;employee assistance programs which offer confidential substance abuse rehabilitation programs; and financial/retirement planning programs(Schuster, 1989: pp. 65-66). According

to Schneider and Zalesny(1982: p.37),the above kinds of activities "...promote human growth by transcending the university's traditional preoccupation with cognitive development. They draw upon such theories of human growth and development as Maslow's notion of self-actualization, or Alderfer's need for growth, or McClelland's need for achievement."

Current Program Development, The State Level: The State of New Jersey

Faculty development programming, which had its historical origins at the local campus level, has recently become part of a formal, public planning process. During the spring of 1986, the New Jersey Department of Higher Education sponsored a series of "faculty dialogues" attended by 140 state and community college faculty members. The vast majority of the attendees expressed the notion that a statewide focus on issues of faculty development was needed. In response, the DHE proposed a "...comprehensive, multifaceted initiative designed to support college faculty in their quest for excellence(Hollander, 1987). " The DHE proposed to support and strengthen the college faculty through an initiative that consists of the following seven goals:

1. To improve the quality of teaching
2. To enhance the conditions on campus necessary for effective faculty development.
3. To support faculty in their respective disciplines.
4. To recognize the contributions of extraordinary faculty.
5. To promote the development of the faculty profession.
6. To provide for a strong faculty in New Jersey during a time of national shortage.
7. To provide for direct contact between faculty and the Board of Higher Education.

The DHE, in order to pursue these goals, proposes new institutes, agencies, programs and seminars. The centerpiece of the proposed five year, six million dollar plan is to be an Institute for Collegiate Teaching and Learning designed to assist faculty in teaching effectiveness. The Institute will be located on a state college campus and administered by an independent board appointed by the State Board of Higher Education. The Institute, funded by the DHE, "...would be engaged in activities ranging from the review and dissemination of research on teaching and learning to the organization of statewide conferences and workshops as well as the training of faculty who would train other faculty on their campuses in a variety of techniques to increase teaching effectiveness."

In addition, a Center for Higher Education Leadership,

to be located on a New Jersey college, is proposed and is directed to focus on training in areas such as organizational development, effective governance, and planning for institutional change. The Center would also seek to develop "home grown" leadership among college faculty through a Leadership Fellows Program.

Most recently, a "faculty development networking committee" has been formed within the DHE. On April 28, 1989, this committee organized the First Annual Faculty Development Conference at Princeton University. The purpose of the conference was "...to address key issues in faculty development that are of importance to New Jersey colleges and to share information about ongoing efforts in faculty development(Smith, 1989)." Their program included presentations by two nationally known faculty development leaders, Jack Schuster, The Claremont Graduate School, and Ann Lucas, Fairleigh Dickinson University. A critical evaluation of these recent state initiated activities, in terms of their potential impact at the local community college level, will be made in a subsequent section. Let us now turn our attention to faculty development activities and structures at the community college level.

Community College Faculty Development

A Case Study:

Brookdale Community College

Faculty development activities on the Brookdale Community College campus, Lincroft,NJ, exist at four basic levels:

1. Formally organized activities. The core of faculty development at BCC is the Faculty Development Committee. The Committee is divided into seven sub-committees for each unit of the college(A& E, faculty, support staff), a total of 21 sub-committees. Each sub-committee is charged witha specific goal: wellness; faculty recognition; faculty exchange; recreation and social events; travel; special projects; research. In recent years, the largest faculty response has been in the form of applications to the travel committee for supplemental travel funds.

2. the Center for Educational Research. Funded by a DHE grant, the Center has sponsored faculty research , teaching excellence, and luncheon workshops which are generally well attended. The Forum, a faculty/staff development publication, is also funded by the Center.

3.Contractual. In this category is the most traditional form of activity, the sabbatical.

4. Informal. Numerous workshops, seminars and programs are presented throughout the college by different units and departments. Writing across the curriculum, the Holocaust

Center(recently praised by Governor Kean), Computer Literacy, and the Science and Technology Issues series represent some of the activities available for faculty and staff.

In January, 1989, a full time line position, the Coordinator for Faculty/Staff Development, was created. This office is filled by a former faculty member and is charged with the function of disseminating information about faculty development opportunities at the local, state, and national level. Let us conclude with a brief look at the literature which has attempted to determine the ingredients of effective faculty development.

Faculty Development: What Works

Over the last decade, an extensive literature has emerged which attempts to delineate those elements associated with the most effective faculty development programs(Nelsen, 1983; Nelsen and Siegal, 1980;Schuster, 1986; Eble and McKeachie, 1985). The following are the most commonly cited facors.

A multifaceted, flexible approach appears to be most effective. Colleges that have instituted only a single form of faculty renewal tend to reach only a small portion of the faculty. To the extent that colleges offer a variety of opportunities--for research, teaching improvement, curricular change, and for the organizing of faculty development policies--they seem to reach more faculty and achieve a more lasting

effect.

Individual activity in faculty renewal must be balanced by corporate activities that give faculty the chance to work closely with colleaugues and take broad institutional goals into account. Programs like computer literacy training classes and student writing seminars are examples of successful corporate faculty development programming. Faculty engaged in group activities have reported gains in both scholarly pursuits and in their classroom teaching.

Programs are more likely to be effective if members of the faculty feel that the program is their program, rather than one imposed upon them by their administration or an outside agency. Some Community College faculty have exressed this concern with regard to the DHE's five year plan. Specifically, community college faculty are not convinced that the proposed programs will trickle down in ways that will effectively improve working conditions on two year college campuses. Participants in a recent dialogue with Larry Marcus, DHE Community College Office, argued that the faculty of community colleges have the most teaching expertise, and therefore, the Institute for Collegiate Teaching should be located on the campus of a two year college.

Teaching improvement programs should continue to be a part of faculty development, but they should be carried out with sensitivity. Past teaching improvement programs were

either not specific enough or too clinical in their approach. The most successful programs concentrated upon specific teaching skills and techniques, and did not communicate the assumption that something was clearly wrong with the quality of teaching on campus.

Lastly, the overall organizational climate on campus must be encouraging to faculty renewal efforts. A positive climate is generally associated with adequate budgets for faculty development, a committee structure that gives faculty a prominent role, a reward structure that clearly supports continuing renewal, and a community of support from both faculty and administration. Because an interest in resolving career problems, i.e., "burnout," is the primary interest of the person experiencing them, action ideally will be initiated by the faculty member and the institution will act as facilitator.

Concluding Remarks

Much has been written about the meaning of work in "post-industrial" society. Academic research as well as popular journalistic accounts seem to share a common theme in the frequent reference to a form of employee dissatisfaction generally termed "burnout." This work related malaise, characterized by low levels of intrinsic satisfaction, was once thought to be limited to unskilled assembly line labor.

Recent survey research, however, suggests that even those in professional careersare not, by virtue of their status, immune to this phenomenon. Unlike the weather--about which we frequently complain, but can can do little to change--the social and psychological conditions od work can be shaped by deliberate, organized action. Faculty development strategies are still evolving and changing form and content as social/cultural contextural factors change. It is encouraging, however, to see that "faculty development" has become an institutionalized component of the academic workplace.

References

Baldwin, et.al., Expanding Faculty Options, Washington D.C.: AAHE,1981.

Baldwin and Blackburn, eds., College Faculty: Versatile Human Resources in a Period of Constraint, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Blackburn, R.T.,et. al., "Are Institutional Improvement Programs Off-Target?" in Current Issues in Higher Education, Washington D.C.: AAHE, 1980.

Clark, et. al., Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity, New York: Teachers Colleges Press, 1986.

Cohen and Brawer, The Two-Year College Instructor Today, New York: Praeger Publishing, 1977.

Eble and McKeachie, Improving Undergraduate Education Through Faculty Development, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Freedman, M. Academic Culture and Faculty Development, Berkeley: Montaigne, Inc., 1979.

Gaff, Jerry, Toward Faculty Renewal, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Hollander, T. Edward, DHE memorandum, 11/6/87.

Hollinger, D. "T.S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and Its Implications for History," AHR, April, 1973.

Kuhn, T. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.

Kuklick, B. "History as a Way of Learning," American Quarterly, Fall, 1970.

Light, D. "Thinking About Faculty," Daedalus, 103, 1984.

Mancillas, W. "Academic Burnout: A Call to Action," Thought and Action, Fall, 1988.

Melendez and Guzman, The New Academic Disease, Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Nelsen, W. "Faculty Who Stay: Renewing our Most Important Resource," College Faculty: Versatile Resources in a Period of Constraint, Baldwin and Blackburn, eds., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Nelsen and Siegel, eds., Effective Approaches to Faculty Development, Washington, D.C.: AAC, 1980.

O' Banion, Terry, Teachers for Tomorrow, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Sanford, N. "Academic Culture anf the Teacher's Development," Soundings, 1971.

Schuster, Jack and Howard Bowen, American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled, London: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Schuster, Jack,"The Personal Dimension: Faculty Development," Thought and Action, Spring, 1989.

Smith, Clauszell, DHE memorandum, 3/3/89.

Stern, Joyce, ed., The Condition of Education: Post-Secondary Education, Washington D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1988.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 04 1989